

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

June 16, 2009

\_\_\_\_\_  
No. 08-40435  
Conference Calendar  
\_\_\_\_\_

Charles R. Fulbruge III  
Clerk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Plaintiff-Appellee

v.

JAMON EARL JAMES LEE

Defendant-Appellant

\_\_\_\_\_  
Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Eastern District of Texas  
USDC No. 1:07-CR-125-3  
\_\_\_\_\_

Before SMITH, BENAVIDES, and HAYNES, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

The attorney appointed to represent Jamon Earl James Lee has moved for leave to withdraw and has filed a brief in accordance with *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967). Lee has filed a response. The record is insufficiently developed to allow consideration at this time of Lee's claims of ineffective assistance of counsel; such claims generally "cannot be resolved on direct appeal when [they have] not been raised before the district court since no opportunity existed to develop the record on the merits of the allegations." *United States v.*

\_\_\_\_\_  
\* Pursuant to 5TH CIR. R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.4.

*Cantwell*, 470 F.3d 1087, 1091 (5th Cir. 2006) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). Our independent review of the record, counsel's brief, and Lee's response discloses no nonfrivolous issue for appeal. Accordingly, counsel's motion for leave to withdraw is GRANTED, counsel is excused from further responsibilities herein, and the APPEAL IS DISMISSED. *See* 5TH CIR. R. 42.2. Lee's motion for appointment of counsel is DENIED.